



1 Department of Personnel. On November 12, 1998, Mary Ann Parsons, Personnel Hearings Officer,  
2 conducted an allocation review hearing. By letters dated December 7, 1998, Ms. Parsons notified  
3 the Appellants that their positions were properly allocated to the Office Support Supervisor 1  
4 classification. On January 4, 1999, Appellants filed timely exceptions to the Director's  
5 determination with the Personal Appeals Board.

6  
7 **Summary of Appellants' Argument.** Appellants argue that Respondent erred in concluding that  
8 they have more responsibility for overseeing the clerical support operations of the office rather than  
9 performing one-on-one secretarial support duties. Appellants argue that Respondent also erred in  
10 concluding that they make travel arrangements only on an occasional basis and in concluding that  
11 their supervisors maintain their own calendars and normally make their own appointments.  
12 Appellants state that prior to being reallocated to the Office Support Supervisor 1 classification,  
13 they were in classes specific to the Department of Transportation because the nature of their duties  
14 was unique to the Department. Appellants contend that the designee's determination shows a clear  
15 attempt to make their duties fit into the Office Support series by downplaying the amount of time  
16 they spend making travel arrangements for superintendents and crews. Appellants contend that the  
17 time they spend making travel arrangements is more than "occasional." Appellants also assert that  
18 while their supervisors can access their own calendars and schedule time, they must first check with  
19 Appellants to ensure they do not double book their time. Appellants contend that there is no current  
20 classification which is a perfect fit but that on a best fit basis they should be allocated to the  
21 Secretary Supervisor classification.

22  
23 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent contends that Appellants perform some duties  
24 which are traditional secretarial work, but that the majority of the duties they perform are not  
25 secretarial in nature. Respondent contends that Appellants do not perform the one-on-one  
26 secretarial support duties required by the Secretary Supervisor class because more than 50 percent

1 of their work time is spent performing duties clerical in nature, such as word processing tasks and  
2 responding to phone inquiries. Respondent argues that the majority of Appellants' duties do not  
3 meet the intent of the secretarial class series and that the Secretary Supervisor class is not  
4 appropriate. Respondent argues that it recognizes the unique nature of Appellants' duties but that  
5 on a best fit basis they are appropriately classified to the Office Support Supervisor 1 classification.

6  
7 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that the employees' positions are properly  
8 allocated to the Office Support Supervisor 1 classification should be affirmed.

9  
10 **Relevant Classifications.** Office Support Supervisor 1, class code 01013; and Secretary  
11 Supervisor; class code 01024.

12  
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
15 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
16 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
17 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
18 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
19 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
20 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21  
22 The class series intent for the Office Support Supervisor series is to supervise staff and oversee the  
23 clerical support operations. The class series intent for the Secretary Supervisor series is to perform  
24 work in support of a supervisor, to provide secretarial services and to assist the supervisor by  
25 facilitating the supervisor's own work and relieving the supervisor of day-to-day clerical activities.

1 Appellants are responsible for a variety of duties, including supervision of staff (conducting  
2 interviews and recommending employment selections, providing training; scheduling assignments;  
3 conducting annual evaluations; initiating corrective/disciplinary action and reviewing work  
4 performed by others). Appellants compose and prepare a variety of correspondence; attend  
5 meetings on behalf of the superintendent/assistant superintendent, take and transcribe notes;  
6 maintain their supervisors' calendars and schedule their time; and make travel arrangements and  
7 prepare travel related vouchers for the superintendent or other staff/crew members. Appellants  
8 have frequent contact with clients, the public, other staff members within the Department and other  
9 agencies, and they receive and resolve complaints. These duties encompass a majority of  
10 Appellants' time.

11  
12 Appellants' other duties include performing complex word processing tasks, maintaining and  
13 monitoring budget/fiscal records, and operating highway radios.

14  
15 Position allocations are "based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or  
16 performed and other information and recommendations." (WAC 356-20-020). Because a current  
17 and accurate description of a position's duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved  
18 Classification Questionnaire, the CQ becomes the basis for allocation of a position. Position  
19 allocations are made on a best fit basis. An allocation determination must be based on the overall  
20 duties and responsibilities, as documented in the CQ.

21  
22 In this case, the director's designee determined that she saw the "responsibility of the Appellants as  
23 overseeing the clerical support operations of the office more than the one-on-one secretarial support  
24 required" by the Secretary Supervisor class. She further states that "appellants make travel  
25 arrangements occasionally. The supervisors maintain their own calendars and normally make their  
26 own appointments."

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

Appellants' CQs submitted for review of their positions were approved by their supervisors and represent a current and accurate description of their duties and responsibilities. Therefore, we are basing our review and decision on these approved CQs. We disagree that Appellants spend the majority of their time overseeing clerical support operations and performing duties that are the same or similar to their subordinate staff and overseeing clerical support operations.

Appellants use independent judgment in performing a variety of complex secretarial duties and responsibilities which include attending meetings on behalf of the supervisors; developing work methods; monitoring and evaluating budgets; assisting in the development of budgets; scheduling their supervisors' time; and coordinating travel arrangements for their supervisors' and others, including region-wide work crews. In addition, Appellants are responsible for facilities, purchasing and inventory control. When considering the level, breadth and complexity of responsibilities intended to be encompassed by the Secretary Supervisor classification and comparing these to the variety of duties and level of responsibilities performed by Appellants' positions as a whole, we conclude that on a best fit basis, Appellants' positions should be reallocated to the Secretary Senior classification.

**Conclusion.** Appellants' appeals should be granted, and their positions should be reallocated to the Secretary Supervisor classification.

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeals of Diana Meagher, Lynn Baxter, Lori Kazai, Sharon Carley, Sheryl Read, Roy Short, Keith Kennaugh and Jeri Rahm are granted, the Director's determinations are reversed, and Appellants' positions are reallocated to the class of Secretary Supervisor.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 1999.

**WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nathan S. Ford Jr., Member